



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/905,506	07/12/2001	Shell Sterling Simpson	10008181-1	3369
7590	04/22/2005		EXAMINER	
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY Intellectual Property Administration P.O. Box 272400 Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400			SINGH, SATWANT K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2626	

DATE MAILED: 04/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/905,506	SIMPSON ET AL.
	Examiner Satwant K. Singh	Art Unit 2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 July 2001.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/10/01</u> | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 1-5, and 7-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Maeda et al. (US 6,791,703).
2. Regarding Claim 1, Maeda et al disclose a method comprising: receiving a user selection of one or more print options via a network service (Figs 5A and 5B) (client terminal 9 for issuing an operation instruction to the digital copier 1 and a www server 10 are connected to the network 10a) (col. 4, lines 60-62), wherein the one or more print options are identified for subsequent resolution, (Fig. 6) and wherein the one or more print options can be applied to one or more other network services (Fig. 6, Print 604, Monitor 603, Add Bookmark, 605).
3. Regarding Claim 2, Maeda et al disclose a method, wherein the network services comprises an Internet imaging home page (Fig. 5A) (URL 502 is used to specify the domain name of the WWW server at which a home page to be printed is stored) (col. 7, lines 12-17).
4. Regarding Claim 3, Maeda et al disclose a method, wherein the one or more other network services comprise one or more other printing services communicatively coupled to the network service (Fig. 6, Print 604, Monitor 603, Add Bookmark, 605).

5. Regarding Claim 4, Maeda et al disclose a method, further comprising: receiving a user-selected name for the one or more print options (Fig. 6, document title 501) (co. 7, lines 9-11); storing the one or more print options as associated with the user-selected name (Fig. 5 is a diagram showing a list of items A that a user can set by using the print utility) (col. 7, lines 5-6) (Fig. 7, HTML print option); and allowing subsequent selection of the one or more print options by the user based on the user-selected name (Fig. 5 is a diagram showing a list of items A that a user can set by using the print utility) (col. 7, lines 5-6) (Fig. 7, HTML print option).

6. Regarding Claim 5, Maeda et al disclose one or more computer readable media having stored thereon a plurality of instructions that, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform acts including: communicating a plurality of possible print options to a client computer (Figs 5A and 5B) (client terminal 9 for issuing an operation instruction to the digital copier 1 and a www server 10 are connected to the network 10a) (col. 4, lines 60-62); receiving a user indication of selected ones of the plurality of possible print options (Fig. 5 is a diagram showing a list of items A that a user can set by using the print utility) (col. 7, lines 5-6); receiving an identifier, indicated by the user, associated with the selected print options (Fig. 6, document title) (co. 7, lines 9-11); saving the selected print options with the associated identifier (Fig. 6, Option File 505) (option file 505 is a file in which all the conditions set by the print utility are stored) (col. 7, lines 27-31); and making the selected print options subsequently available to the user for configuring of a plurality of

printers (Fig. 6, Printer address 503) (printer address 503 is the network address of a digital copier) (co. 7, lines 18-20).

7. Regarding Claim 7, Maeda et al disclose one or more computer readable media, wherein the making further comprises making the selected print options subsequently available for user-selection by the identifier associated with the selected print options (Fig. 5 is a diagram showing a list of items A that a user can set by using the print utility) (col. 7, lines 5-6) (Fig. 7, HTML print option).

8. Regarding Claim 8, Maeda et al disclose one or more computer readable media, further comprising saving a plurality of sets of selected print options and associated identifiers (option file 505 is a file in which all the conditions set by the print utility are stored) (col. 7, lines 27-31), and making each of the plurality of sets of selected print options subsequently available to the user for configuring of a plurality of printers (printer address 503 is the network address of a digital copier) (co. 7, lines 18-20).

9. Regarding Claim 9, Maeda et al disclose a graphical user interface comprising: a plurality of portions illustrating user-selectable print options and graphical mechanisms via which a user can select the print options (Figs. 6-10)); an additional user-input mechanism via which the user can input an identifier of the selected print options (Fig. 6, Document title 501); and another graphical mechanism via which the user can indicate a desire to save the selected print options as associated with the identifier and for subsequent provision to a plurality of printers (Fig. 6, Option File 505, Printer Address 503).

10. Regarding Claim 10, Maeda et al disclose a graphical user interface, wherein one or more of the graphical mechanisms in the plurality of portions comprises a checkbox (Fig. 7, Page options).

11. Regarding Claim 11, Maeda et al disclose a graphical user interface, wherein one or more of the graphical mechanisms in the plurality of portions comprises a data input box via which the user can input alphanumeric characters (Fig. 6, Document title, URL, etc.).

12. Regarding Claim 12, Maeda et al disclose a graphical user interface, wherein the identifier of the selected print options comprises a user-specified name (Fig. 6, Document title).

13. Regarding Claim 13, Maeda et al disclose a graphical user interface, wherein the other graphical mechanism comprises a user-selectable on-screen button (Figs. 7-10, OK, Cancel).

14. Regarding Claim 14, Maeda et al disclose a graphical user interface, wherein the graphical mechanisms in the plurality of portions include one or more of: a check box, a radio button, a list box, an editable text box, a command button, a drop-down list, a popup menu, a spinner, and a slider (Figs 6-10).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

15. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

16. Claims 6 and 15-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maeda et al. in view of Davis et al. (US 2002/0059489).

17. Regarding Claim 6, Maeda et al fail to teach one or more computer readable media, wherein each of the plurality of print options is not specific to a particular printer.

Davis et al teach one or more computer readable media, wherein each of the plurality of print options is not specific to a particular printer (local computer can use the remote printer regardless of the local computer's operating system-even if no printer driver exists) (page 4, paragraph [0040]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Maeda with the teachings of Davis to allow remote printing regardless of the specifics of the particular printer.

18. Regarding Claim 15, Maeda et al teach one or more computer readable media having stored thereon a plurality of instructions that, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform acts including: receiving an indication of one of a plurality of sets of print options to be used in printing a document irrespective of a printer on which the document is to be printed (Figs 5A and 5B) (client terminal 9 for issuing an operation instruction to the digital copier 1 and a www server 10 are connected to the network 10a) (col. 4, lines 60-62); receiving an indication of one of a plurality of printers on which the document is to be printed (Fig. 5 is a diagram showing a list of items A that a user can set by using the print utility) (col. 7, lines 5-6);

Maeda et al fail to teach communicating the indicated set of print options to the indicated printer irrespective of whether the printer supports one or more of the print options identified in the set of print options.

Davis et al teach communicating the indicated set of print options to the indicated printer irrespective of whether the printer supports one or more of the print options identified in the set of print options (local computer can use the remote printer regardless of the local computer's operating system-even if no printer driver exists) (page 4, paragraph [0040]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Maeda with the teachings of Davis to allow remote printing regardless of the specifics of the particular printer.

19. Regarding Claim 16, Maeda et al teach one or more computer readable media, wherein the plurality of instructions further cause the one or more processors to perform acts including: determining, based on the indication of the one printer on which the document is to be printed, (Fig. 6, printer address 503) which of the print options in the indicated set of print options is supported by the one printer; and communicating, for display to the user, an indication of which of the print options in the indicated set of print options is supported by the one printer (Fig. 7, Print option).

20. Regarding Claim 17, Maeda et al teach one or more computer readable media, wherein the plurality of instructions further cause the one or more processors to perform acts including: determining, based on the indication of the one printer on which the document is to be printed (Fig. 6, printer address 503), which of the print options in the

indicated set of print options is supported by the one printer; and communicating, for display to the user, an indication of which of the print options in the indicated set of print options is not supported by the one printer (Fig. 7, Print option).

21. Regarding Claim 18, Maeda et al fail to teach one or more computer readable media, wherein the plurality of instructions further cause the one or more processors to perform acts including: determining, for each of the plurality of printers, which of the print options in the indicated set of print options is supported by the printer; identifying one or more of the plurality of printers that support the most print options in the indicated set of print options; and communicating, for display to the user, the identified one or more printers.

Davis et al teach one or more computer readable media, wherein the plurality of instructions further cause the one or more processors to perform acts including: determining, for each of the plurality of printers, which of the print options in the indicated set of print options is supported by the printer ("printer discovery process") (page 2, paragraph [0025]); identifying one or more of the plurality of printers that support the most print options in the indicated set of print options ("printer discovery process") (page 2, paragraph [0025]); and communicating, for display to the user, the identified one or more printers (application 42 sends the document to file manager 44 with specific destination printer and print option information) (page 2, paragraph [0025]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Maeda with the teachings of Davis to allow remote printing regardless of the specifics of the particular printer.

22. Regarding Claim 19, Maeda et al teach a system comprising: a network interface configured to allow the system to communicate with one or more other systems via a network Figs 5A and 5B) (client terminal 9 for issuing an operation instruction to the digital copier 1 and a www server 10 are connected to the network 10a) (col. 4, lines 60-62); and a printer configuration user interface, communicatively coupled to the network interface, wherein the printer configuration user interface is configured to allow a user of a client interface to select print options and group the selection together as a configuration associated with a particular name (Figs. 6-10).

Maeda et al fail to teach a system, wherein the printer configuration user interface is further configured to allow the user to select print options without regard for print options supported by a printer that the user can subsequently print to.

Davis et al teach a system, wherein the printer configuration user interface is further configured to allow the user to select print options without regard for print options supported by a printer that the user can subsequently print to (local computer can use the remote printer regardless of the local computer's operating system-even if no printer driver exists) (page 4, paragraph [0040]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Maeda with the teachings of Davis to allow remote printing regardless of the specifics of the particular printer.

23. Regarding Claim 20, Maeda et al teach a system, further comprising: a print user interface, communicatively coupled to the network interface, wherein the printer user interface is configured to allow the user to select one of the configurations by its

associated name, and further configured to allow the user to select a printer that is to be used to print a document using the configuration (Fig. 6, Document title 501, Printer address 503).

24. Regarding Claim 21, Maeda et al fail to teach a system, wherein the print user interface is further configured to allow the user to select one of the configurations without regard for print options supported by the printer that is to be used to print the document.

Davis et al teach a system, wherein the print user interface is further configured to allow the user to select one of the configurations without regard for print options supported by the printer that is to be used to print the document (local computer can use the remote printer regardless of the local computer's operating system-even if no printer driver exists) (page 4, paragraph [0040]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Maeda with the teachings of Davis to allow remote printing regardless of the specifics of the particular printer.

25. Regarding Claim 22, Maeda et al teach a method, implemented in a print service coupled to a network, the method comprising: receiving, from a device in the network, a print request identifying both a document to be printed and a set of desired print options, wherein the set of desired print options includes a corresponding setting for one or more of the desired print options (Figs. 6-10)

26. Maeda et al fail to teach a method, checking whether a printer corresponding to the print service supports the desired print options; and for each option in the set of

desired print options, applying the setting corresponding to the option if the printer supports the print option, and ignoring the setting corresponding to the option if the printer does not support the print option.

Davis et al teach a method, checking whether a printer corresponding to the print service supports the desired print options; and for each option in the set of desired print options, applying the setting corresponding to the option if the printer supports the print option, and ignoring the setting corresponding to the option if the printer does not support the print option ("printer discovery process") (page 2, paragraph [0025]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Maeda with the teachings of Davis to allow remote printing regardless of the specifics of the particular printer.

27. Regarding Claim 23, Maeda et al fail to teach a method, wherein the print service comprises a print server corresponding to the printer.

Davis et al teach a method, wherein the print service comprises a print server corresponding to the printer (relay server 28).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Maeda with the teaching of Davis to use a print server to identify the print options for the printer.

28. Regarding Claim 24, Maeda et al teach a method, wherein the print service is implemented at the printer (digital copier 1).

29. Regarding Claim 25, Maeda et al fail to teach a method, wherein the applying comprises applying the setting corresponding to the print option if the printer supports

the print option without regard for whether the printer is currently capable of carrying out the print option.

Davis et al teach a method, wherein the applying comprises applying the setting corresponding to the print option if the printer supports the print option without regard for whether the printer is currently capable of carrying out the print option (local computer can use the remote printer regardless of the local computer's operating system-even if no printer driver exists) (page 4, paragraph [0040]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Maeda with the teachings of Davis to allow remote printing regardless of the specifics of the particular printer.

Conclusion

30. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Wikloff et al. (US 6,618,162) disclose an apparatus and method to configure a device, such as a printer, over a network.

Fujitani et al. (US 2001/0034747) disclose remote printing systems and methods for portable digital devices.

Dutta (US 2002/0135800) discloses a method and system for pre-print processing of web-based document to reduce printing costs.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Satwant K. Singh whose telephone number is (571) 272-7468. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kimberly A. Williams can be reached on (571) 272-7471. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Satwant Singh

sk

Satwant K. Singh
Examiner
Art Unit 2626

Kimberly Williams
KIMBERLY WILLIAMS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER